

NEW YORK  
LONDON  
SINGAPORE  
PHILADELPHIA  
CHICAGO  
WASHINGTON, DC  
SAN FRANCISCO  
SILICON VALLEY  
SAN DIEGO  
LOS ANGELES  
TAIWAN  
BOSTON  
HOUSTON  
AUSTIN  
HANOI  
HO CHI MINH CITY

**DuaneMorris®**

*FIRM and AFFILIATE OFFICES*

KELLY A. BONNER  
DIRECT DIAL: +1 215 979 1158  
PERSONAL FAX: +1 215 689 2198  
E-MAIL: [KABonner@duanemorris.com](mailto:KABonner@duanemorris.com)

[www.duanemorris.com](http://www.duanemorris.com)

SHANGHAI  
ATLANTA  
BALTIMORE  
WILMINGTON  
MIAMI  
BOCA RATON  
PITTSBURGH  
NEWARK  
LAS VEGAS  
CHERRY HILL  
LAKE TAHOE  
MYANMAR  
OMAN  
*A GCC REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE  
OF DUANE MORRIS*  
ALLIANCES IN MEXICO  
AND SRI LANKA

October 20, 2021

**VIA ECF**

The Honorable Robert B. Kugler  
United States District Judge  
USDC, District of New Jersey Mitchell  
H. Cohen Building & U.S. Courthouse  
4th & Cooper Streets, Room 1050  
Camden, NJ 08101

The Honorable Thomas Vanaskie  
Special Discovery Master  
Stevens & Lee  
1500 Market Street, East Tower, 18th  
Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

**Re: *In re Valsartan, Losartan, and Irbesartan Products Liability  
Litigation*, Case No. 1:19-md-02875-RBK-KW**

Dear Judge Kugler and Judge Vanaskie:

We write on behalf of Defendants Zhejiang Huahai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. (“ZHP”), Princeton Pharmaceutical Inc. (“Princeton”), Huahai U.S. Inc. (“Huahai U.S.”) and Solco Healthcare US, LLC (“Solco”, and collectively with ZHP, Huahai U.S., and Princeton, “the ZHP Parties”) to respectfully request that the Court permit the ZHP Parties to file a brief reply in further support of their motion to redact and seal portions of the September 10 transcript (ECF No. [1584](#)).

October 20, 2021  
Page 2

The ZHP Parties believe that this reply is necessary to address the ZHP Parties' need to maintain the confidentiality of their proprietary process optimization procedures, which outweighs any countervailing factors alleged by Plaintiffs in their opposition dated October 18, 2021 (ECF No. [1652](#)), and to assist the Court in its consideration of the motion to seal.

The Court has previously permitted reply briefs in support of motions to seal. *See* The ZHP Parties' Reply Supporting Their Motion to Seal dated March 8, 2021 (ECF. No. [1003](#)). Nor is the filing of a reply brief in support of a motion to seal inconsistent with Local Civil Rule 7.1(d)(3), which prohibits the filing of reply briefs unless permitted by the Court relating to only the following motions: Cross under L.Civ.R. 7.1(h); Reconsideration under L.Civ.R. 7.1(i); Case Management under L.Civ.R. 16.1(g)(2); and Discovery under L.Civ.R. 37.1(b)(3). *See* L.Civ.R. 7.1(d)(3)

We further request that the ZHP Parties be permitted to file their reply brief by no later than **November 1, 2021**. We do not believe that extending the customary deadline for reply briefs will prejudice Plaintiffs, and the submission of a reply brief will ensure a fulsome record on the issues presented.

Duane Morris

October 20, 2021  
Page 3

We thank the Court for its courtesies and consideration of this request.

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Kelly A. Bonner*

Kelly A. Bonner